

usage, and would avoid the confusion caused by their premature designation of a lectotype for *macroglossa*.

Applicants who (a) apply to the Commission for a certain action and (b) simultaneously take an action (e.g., lectotype designation) that in effect ties the hands of the Commission and influences or forces a decision in the direction they desire are thereby destroying some alternatives or options that the Commission should have open to it when it considers a case. In the present case, the applicants in their reply to my initial objections cited the existence of a "lectotype designation already in the literature" as one of the "great disadvantages" blocking the use of *macroglossa*. I cannot refrain from pointing out that that "great disadvantage" did not exist until they themselves created it in their application.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *TROPIDOGASTER BLAINVILLII* DUMÉRIL & BIBRON, 1837 (REPTILIA). Z.N.(S.) 1860

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.*)

All of the requests embodied in the original petition are fully justified and I strongly urge approval of them by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. It is strange that no scale for evaluation of merit of names for conservation has ever been erected. Various criteria have been discussed, but the inevitable subjectivity of any potential scale has obviously deterred attempts at their proposal. Yet, however subjectively constructed, any scale approaching comprehensiveness has some merit for evaluation of names proposed for conservation. The following may be of some practical value:

Scale of Eligibility of Names for Conservation, Based on Scope of Usage

1. of notably international, extremely common usage (e.g. *Musca domestica*)
2. of notably international, moderately common usage (e.g. *Sphenodon punctatum*)
3. of notably international, occasional but "landmark" usage (e.g. *Varanus komodoensis*)
4. of notably international, infrequent or rare yet "landmark" usage (e.g. *Barbourula busuangensis*)
5. of moderately international but extremely common local usage (e.g. *Rana pipiens*)
6. of moderately international, moderately common local usage (e.g. *Thamnophis sirtalis*)
7. of moderately international, occasional but "landmark" local usage (e.g. *Rhineura floridana*)
8. of moderately international, infrequent or rare yet "landmark" usage (e.g. *Gynnopis multiplicata*)
9. of negligibly international but extremely common local usage (e.g. *Acris crepitans*)
10. of negligibly international, moderately common local usage (e.g. *Rana areolata*)
11. of negligibly international, occasional but "landmark" local usage (e.g. *Syrrhopus marnockii*)
12. of negligibly international, infrequent or rare yet "landmark" usage (e.g. *Plethodon neomexicanus*)
13. of negligibly international, infrequent or rare and "pedestrian" usage (e.g. *Eumeces copei*)

Measured upon this scale, the name *Chalarodon madagascariensis*, the conservation of which is sought in the petition here discussed, falls certainly no lower than category 3. In my opinion it would be a violation of the fundamental objectives of the Code of the Commission to fail to approve conservation of names of unquestioned venerability and stability falling in any of the first 12 categories of the above scale. The merit of *Chalarodon madagascariensis* for conservation is, by this scale, overwhelming.